

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are pending and being considered. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,273,204 ("Winner et al.").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the following:

an arrangement for **increasing, given a decrease in the time gap, at least one of a maximum possible vehicle acceleration and a maximum possible vehicle deceleration implementable by a speed control system** so that the vehicle is capable of at least one of accelerating and decelerating more quickly given the decrease in the time gap

This feature of claim 1 relates to increasing limit values of (maximum possible vehicle acceleration and/or maximum possible vehicle deceleration implementable by ...) the speed control system given (i.e., dependant on) a time gap to a preceding vehicle is decreased, e.g., by the user. As regards to this feature, the Examiner relies on col. 4, lines 46-59 of Winner et al.; however, this section of Winner et al. does not describe changing limit values based on a decrease in such a time gap. Instead, Winner et al. describes that limit values for acceleration/deceleration are "pregiven," and that they are changeable depending on the dynamic performance desired by a driver. For example, if the driver likes a sportier performance, the maximum acceleration of the vehicle is increased.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Winner et al. does not anticipate claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed.

Claim 5, as presented, recites features generally analogous to claim 1, as presented, and therefore is allowable for at least the similar reasons

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore allowable for generally the same reasons, as discussed above.

In sum, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 2 and 5 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the objection and rejections have been obviated, and that pending and considered claims are therefore allowable. It is therefore

respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 26 Sept 2007

By: 
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646